

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of December 11, 2006. Applicant has cancelled those claims that were objected to or for which the Examiner issued a §112 rejection. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the objection and rejection are now moot.

In response to the prior art claim rejections, Applicant has amended the independent claims to include a limitation based on original claim 5 with additional clarifying language to further distinguish differences over the cited art. In particular, Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite limitations related to embodiments in which a universal remote control icon is used to indicate which buttons of a physical universal remote control have been pressed. For example, claim 1 was amended to recite the limitation: “in response to a user inputting a command by pressing a button of the physical universal remote control, updating said three-dimensional animation to display an animation of the button which was pressed to indicate to the user that the command was received by the media center.” Similarly, claim 19 was amended to recite the limitation of “generating a remote control icon that is a three-dimensional animation of the universal remote control displaying which buttons are pressed to indicate to the user that corresponding commands are received by the media center.” Support for these amendments is found in the original claims and in paragraphs [0037] and [0043]-[0047].

As discussed in Applicant’s specification in paragraph [0007] and [0048] a media center can have a significant response time to respond after a user presses a button on a remote control (e.g., a fraction of a second to even several seconds in some cases). However, consumers often expect a near-instantaneous response. As a result, media center users who press a button of the remote control can become frustrated while waiting for their media center to respond. The claimed invention generates an animation of a button that was pressed on the physical remote control to provide visual feedback to the user that their command is being processed, as described in paragraph [0044].

As previously described, the pending claims include limitations based on original claim 5. The rejection in the Office Action to claim 5 was a 35 USC §103 rejection based on the combination of GOULDEN and KAMEN as discussed on page 10 of the Office Action. The Examiner admitted on page 10 of the Office Action that GOULDEN does not teach displaying activation of a button of a remote control icon. However, KAMEN also does not teach displaying activation of a button of a remote control icon. Instead, KAMEN deals with the completely different situation of showing which keys can be pushed for a particular situation, as

described in column 11, lines 55-63. However, note KAMEN does not teach or suggest indicating which keys of the physical remote controller were previously pressed. As a consequence, an individual using the EPG of KAMEN would not receive a visual cue that a key command that they had pressed into the physical remote control was being processed.

As both GOULDEN and KAMEN fail to teach indicating which keys of a physical remote controller were previously pressed, it is therefore respectfully submitted that the cited art does not teach or suggest the limitation of claim 1 of: "in response to a user inputting a command by pressing a button of the physical universal remote control, updating said three-dimensional animation to display an animation of the button which was pressed to indicate to the user that the command was received by the media center." For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the recited art does not teach or suggest the limitation of claim 19 of "generating a remote control icon that is a three-dimensional animation of the universal remote control displaying which buttons are pressed to indicate to the user that corresponding commands are received by the media center."

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if there are any residual issues that can be resolved through a telephone call.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees to Deposit


Account No. 50-1283.

Dated: April 3, 2007

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5625
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

By: _____


Edward Van Gieson
Reg. No. 44,386